DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 788 FL 010 283

AUTHOR Bruzzese, Giannina
TITLE The Effect of Formal Instruction on the Pidginized Speech of One Second Language Learner.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum (2nd, Los Angeles, California, October 6-8, 1978) ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; *English (Second Language); Grammar; *Italian; *Language Instruction; *Language Research; *Morphemes; Morphology (Languages); Negative Forms (Language); *Pidgins; Plurals; *Second Language Learning; Social Factors; Student Motivation; Verbs

ABSTRACT

The effect of formal instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL) on the pidginized speech of a second language learner was studied. The subject was a 76-year-old Italian woman residing in the United States since the age of 37. Four one-hour tapes were made of the subject's speech in April of 1976, and during the last five months of a two-semester elementary ESL course. In the fall of 1977, at the beginning of an intermediate ESL course, elicited imitations were recorded. The subject's speech samples, which consisted of both free and elicited speech, were examined for changes in the production of negatives, the copula, regular and irregular past tense, third person present tense "s", and plural. Results indicate no significant effect on any of the above features. Age, social distance, and motivation are discussed as possible explanations for the minimal effects of instruction on the subject's pidginized English. (AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169788

The Effect of Formal Instruction on the Pidginized Speech of One Second Language Learner

Giannina Bruzzese

University of California, Los Angeles

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gianmna Bruzzese

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum

Los Angeles, October 6-8, 1978

© Giannina Bruzzese

FL010283

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The purpose of this research was to study the effect of formal instruction on the pidginized speech of one second language learner. I will first discuss pidginization, then I will give a biographical sketch of my subject. The data will then be discussed followed by suggested reasons for the results.

A pidgin language is a simplified and reduced form of speech used for communication between people with different languages. It is the native language of none of its speakers. A pidgin language is characterized by a limited vocabulary, an elimination of grammatical devices and a lack of inflectional morphology.

In discussing pidginization, Keith Whinnom (1971) distinguishes between a contact situation in which the target language (TL) is the norm to which speakers are aspiring and a contact situation in which the TL is removed from consideration. He compares the process of pidginization to the biological process of hybridization. Primary hybridization refers to the breaking up of a species language into races or dialects. Secondary hybridization results when one language group enters another language group community. Tertiary hybridization results when the TL is removed from consideration among speakers of different languages. For the purposes of this study I will claim that secondary hybridization includes the pidginization of a second language learner's speech.

The position taken by those studying second language acquisition (SLA) in relation to pidginization is that the process of pidginization is involved in both secondary and tertiary hybridization. Samarin (1971) sees pidgins as a special case of pidginization - the process taken to its ultimate end. Schumann (1978)

sees SLA as representing secondary hybridization which could conceivably result in a true pidgin if the TL were removed and this interlanguage became a means of communication between speakers with different native languages. Similar processes are involved in both pidginization and SLA, namely simplification and reduction. Therefore, in the speech of a pidginized second language learner we would expect to find limited vocabulary, an elimination of grammatical devices and a lack of inflectional morphology.

Biographical Sketch

The subject for this study was my grandmother, Angela, an Italian speaker. She was born in Italy in 1899 and came to America when she was 37 years old. She lived in New York from 1937 to 1960, returning to Italy only once, in 1954, for a six month visit. She had had no formal training in English either in Italy or the United States prior to the fall of 1976. In 1960 she moved to California.

When she first moved to New York, Angela lived in an all-Italian neighborhood. After four years the family moved to an ethnically-mixed neighborhood where Angela began to have non-Italian speaking friends. She has always been a homemaker so that her main contact with English has come mainly from these non-Italian speaking friends and her dealings with shopkeepers, etc. Her family all speak Italian with the exception of some grandchildren who do understand some Italian and new members of the family such as the husbands and wives of grandchildren.

Her move to California has brought Angela into contact with more English speaking people. Nine years ago she became involved with a women's club which is affiliated with her church. For the last four years she has attended senior citizen meetings. This

has made it possible and mandatory for Angela to use her English more frequently than she had done previously. She lives with her daughter and her daughter's family.

The first study of Angela's speech took place between January and April of 1976. Four one-hour tapes were made in Angela's home. Approximately one quarter of the time was spent on elicited questions and negatives. Angela began an elementary adult ESL class taught by myself in the fall of 1976. She attended the class an average of two nights a week - 2½ hours for each class. Her oral production was taped once a month for the last five months of the school year. (February - July)

Angela continued to attend an intermediate ESL class an average of three nights a week - 2½ hours for each class. The course began in the fall of 1977 and I was, again, the instructor. In October and November of 1977, elicited imitations were recorded. In the elicited imitations the interviewer provided the subject with a sentence which the subject was then asked to repeat.

Another hour of free speech which involved Angela and a non-Italian speaker with whom she was acquainted was recorded in March, 1978. This was done to ascertain whether Angela's speech would change when conversing with a non-Italian speaking, non-family member.

The tapes made prior to and during instruction involved both free and elicited speech. The same or similar situations used to elicit negatives and interrogatives in the pre-instruction study were used to elicit these same structures in the tapes made during instruction.

In this paper I will discuss negatives, the copula, regular and irregular past tense, third person present tense s and plural.

Negatives

Table 1 gives the percentages calculated from both studies for free and elicited negatives. Don't know was excluded from the percentage count in both stuides because it exists as a chunk-learned phrase and does not show acquisition of do + negative.

In the pre-instruction study, Angela used the correct negative 22% of the time. The correct negatives were always of the form can't V or never V (V = verb). The negation of the copula was introduced to the class before the tapings began. Can't was introduced in January, don't and doesn't in February. Doesn't was reviewed and didn't was introduced to the class in April. All of the negative forms were reviewed in June and, again, in the fall of 1977.

In Tape 1 of the second study (second study will refer to the study made during instruction) Angela correctly supplied the negative 29% of the time. This is the only instance in which the percentage for correct free-speech negatives is higher than the one recorded for the pre-instruction study. The figure for Tape 2 is 9%, lower than the 22% for the pre-instruction study. Tape 7, the latest taping made, shows 17% correct for negatives, again lower than 22%. When Angela used the negative correctly, it was generally can't V or never V. There was one occurrence of doesn't V in Tape 1 and the copula + negative construction occurred twice, once in Tape 3 and once in Tape 6.

It would appear, then, that instruction had no significant effect on Angela's free speech negatives. The kinds of negatives used correctly are the same in both studies. It is also interesting that there was a higher percentage of correct negatives used in the pre-instruction study than in six out of the seven speech samples taken during instruction.

Tape 1

Distribution of Negatives Used in Free and Elicited Speech

	Pre-Instruc.	Tape 1	Tape 2	Tape 3	Tape 4	Tape 5	Tape 6	Tape 7	Imi.
No V	.78 ($\frac{180}{232}$)	.71 ($\frac{48}{68}$)	.91 ($\frac{63}{69}$)	.87 ($\frac{54}{62}$)	.81 ($\frac{66}{82}$)	.86 ($\frac{42}{49}$)	.89 ($\frac{43}{49}$)	.83 ($\frac{95}{114}$)	
Can't V	.21 ($\frac{49}{232}$)	.22 ($\frac{15}{65}$)	.07 ($\frac{5}{69}$)	.10 ($\frac{6}{62}$)	.17 ($\frac{14}{82}$)	.14 ($\frac{7}{49}$)	.10 ($\frac{5}{49}$)	.15 ($\frac{17}{114}$)	
Never V	.01 ($\frac{3}{232}$)	.06 ($\frac{4}{68}$)	.02 ($\frac{1}{69}$)	.02 ($\frac{1}{62}$)	.02 ($\frac{2}{82}$)	.		.02 ($\frac{2}{114}$)	
Other		.01 ($\frac{1}{68}$)		.02 ($\frac{1}{62}$)			.02 ($\frac{1}{49}$)		
Total cor.	.22	.29	.09	.14	.19	.14	.12	.17	
Elicited correct	.02 ($\frac{2}{95}$)	.30 ($\frac{7}{24}$)	.17 ($\frac{4}{23}$)	.	.30 ($\frac{8}{27}$)	.10 ($\frac{3}{29}$)			.19 ($\frac{3}{16}$)
Free & Elici. correct	.16	.30	.11		.22	.13			

Elicited Negatives

In the pre-instruction study Angela correctly supplied the negative in elicited sentences 2% of the time. In Tape 1 of the second study she correctly supplied the negative 30% of the time; in Tape 2, 17% of the time; in Tape 4, 30% of the time; in Tape 5, 10% of the time. In the elicited imitations, the negative was correctly supplied 19% of the time. Each figure is consistently higher than that of the pre-instruction study. This finding is consistent with that of Schumann (1976) in his study of Alberto. After Schumann had taught Alberto how to negate in English, Alberto's negatives were about 64% correct in elicited speech. In free speech they were about 20% correct. Before instruction his negatives showed 22% correct in elicited speech and 10% correct in free speech. For both Angela and Alberto the percentage of correctly supplied negatives is higher in the elicited situations than in free speech. Instruction evidently has an effect on this kind of highly monitored (Krashen, 1977), test-like situation.

It is important to examine which negatives are correctly elicited. Can't V, never V and copula + negative are the negatives which were correct in the elicited speech. In the elicited imitations only can't V and don't know were correctly imitated. Never was not included in the elicited imitations. Although the negative is correctly supplied more often in the speech samples taken during instruction, the types of negatives supplied are the same as those supplied in the pre-instruction study. Angela does not use doesn't V or didn't V in either study.

Ne - No

In the pre-instruction study the data showed that ne and no substituted for not in all but sentence final position and before

yet. Ne was used 59% of the time and no was used 41% of the time. In the second study not is again found in sentence final position. The data shows, however, that the use of no as a substitute for not increases over time in the second study. We do not see a steady increase, though. In Tape 1 no is used 89% of the time, whereas in Tape 3 it is used 58% of the time. In Tape 4 it is used 100% of the time. The figures for the use of no are consistently higher in the second study than in the pre-instruction study. The figures for ne are consistently lower in the second study. (See Table 2)

It would appear as if Angela has begun to replace the use of an Italian negative conjunction ne with an English negative no. Thus, no has become the preferred substitute for not. One can only speculate as to the effect of instruction in this area. No was not taught as a substitute for not. It could be that Angela began to realize that ne should not be used in English and decided that no would be the proper negative to use since she uses it with such frequency in her verbal negations.

Table 2

No and Ne as Substitutes for Not

	No	Ne
Pre.	.41 (9/22)	.59 (13/22)
Tape 1	.89 (8/9)	.11 (1/9)
Tape 2	.68 (15/22)	.32 (7/22)
Tape 3	.58 (7/12)	.42 (5/12)
Tape 4	1.00 (13/13)	
Tape 5	.89 (8/9)	.11 (1/9)
Tape 6	.87 (13/15)	.13 (2/15)
Tape 7	.83 (10/12)	.17 (2/12)

Copula

Present tense. Table 3 lists the percentages recorded in both studies for present tense copula. The copula was the first structure taught to my beginning ESL class. I reinforced the paradigm throughout the year. I believe that the effect of instruction is particularly important in this area because of the amount of time devoted to it in my class.

First person singular am was correctly supplied 86% of the time in the pre-instruction study, always in its contracted form. In the second study it was supplied 100% of the time in Tapes 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7. The percentages for both Tapes 2 and 6 are lower than the percentage received in the pre-instruction study. In the case of the elicited imitations, instruction did not improve performance. The first person copula was supplied only 75% of the time. Am was found only in its contracted form in the second study.

Second person singular are was present 18% of the time in the pre-instruction study. In the study made during instruction we find are only in Tape 6 and in the elicited imitations and it is used only once in each of the speech samples. Are is usually deleted in Angela's speech. Instruction had no effect in this area.

In the pre-instruction speech third person singular is was correctly supplied 53% of the time. The percentages recorded in the second study never equaled 53%, with the exception of the elicited imitations. As was true in the pre-instruction study, is was generally present in its contracted form and usually appeared with the pronouns he and she. The full copula was used when it appeared sentence initially, after a noun or sentence finally.

There were no occasions in the pre-instruction study in

Tape 3

Distribution of Forms Supplied in Present Tense Copula Contexts

		Pre-instru.	Tape 1	Tape 2	Tape 3	Tape 4	Tape 5	Tape 6	Tape 7	Imi.
Singular										
1st	am	.86 ($\frac{24}{28}$)	1.00 ($\frac{9}{9}$)	.81 ($\frac{13}{16}$)	1.00 ($\frac{2}{2}$)	1.00 ($\frac{2}{2}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	.62 ($\frac{8}{13}$)	1.00 ($\frac{8}{8}$)	.75 ($\frac{3}{4}$)
	ø	.11 ($\frac{3}{28}$)		.19 ($\frac{3}{16}$)				.30 ($\frac{4}{13}$)		.25 ($\frac{1}{4}$)
	Ital.	.03 ($\frac{1}{28}$)						.08 ($\frac{1}{13}$)		
2nd	are	.18 ($\frac{2}{11}$)	.00 ($\frac{0}{2}$)	.00 ($\frac{0}{5}$)			.00 ($\frac{0}{7}$)	.16 ($\frac{1}{6}$)		.14 ($\frac{1}{7}$)
	ø	.82 ($\frac{9}{11}$)	1.00 ($\frac{2}{2}$)	.80 ($\frac{4}{5}$)			1.00 ($\frac{7}{7}$)	.84 ($\frac{5}{6}$)	.81 ($\frac{13}{16}$)	.71 ($\frac{5}{7}$)
	's			:20 ($\frac{1}{5}$)					:19 ($\frac{13}{16}$)	
	is									.14 ($\frac{1}{7}$)
3rd	is	.53 ($\frac{63}{119}$)	.47 ($\frac{15}{32}$)	.47 ($\frac{28}{59}$)	.36 ($\frac{17}{48}$)	.30 ($\frac{12}{40}$)	.38 ($\frac{21}{55}$)	.39 ($\frac{22}{56}$)	.40 ($\frac{37}{93}$)	.53 ($\frac{8}{15}$)
	ø	.23 ($\frac{28}{119}$)	.25 ($\frac{8}{32}$)	.24 ($\frac{14}{59}$)	.41 ($\frac{20}{48}$)	.28 ($\frac{11}{40}$)	.33 ($\frac{18}{55}$)	.46 ($\frac{26}{56}$)	.27 ($\frac{25}{93}$)	.47 ($\frac{7}{15}$)
	's	.23 ($\frac{28}{119}$)	.28 ($\frac{9}{32}$)	.29 ($\frac{17}{59}$)	.23 ($\frac{11}{48}$)	.42 ($\frac{17}{40}$)	.29 ($\frac{16}{55}$)	.14 ($\frac{8}{56}$)	.31 ($\frac{29}{93}$)	
	was								.02 ($\frac{2}{93}$)	
Plural										
3rd	are		.00 ($\frac{0}{2}$)			.00 ($\frac{0}{1}$)	.00 ($\frac{0}{3}$)	.00 ($\frac{0}{1}$)	.00 ($\frac{0}{5}$)	
	ø		.50 ($\frac{1}{2}$)			1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	.33 ($\frac{1}{3}$)		.40 ($\frac{2}{5}$)	
	Ital.		.50 ($\frac{1}{2}$)				.33 ($\frac{1}{3}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	.20 ($\frac{1}{5}$)	
	is						.33 ($\frac{1}{3}$)		.40 ($\frac{2}{5}$)	

which the plural copula was used. Although we find occasion for its use in the second study, the plural copula is not used. It is either deleted, or *is* or an Italian copula is used.

Instruction had no significant effect on the present tense copula in Angela's speech. In the case of the first person singular copula *am*, one might construe growth because it was supplied 100% of the time in five out of the seven tapes. We must look at the number of occasions of use, however. In three out of the five tapes where *am* is supplied 100% of the time there were only one or two occasions of use. When the numbers are larger, as in Tapes 2 and 6, the percentages are lower than the percentage recorded in the pre-instruction study. Thus, it is not possible to say with any certainty that instruction has affected Angela's performance in this area.

Past tense. Table 4 gives the percentages for the past tense copula for both studies. In the pre-instruction study the first person singular *was* was correctly supplied 100% of the time. In the second study it was supplied 100% of the time in Tapes 1, 2 and 4. In Tapes 3, 6 and 7 the percentages are lower than 100%.

There was no use of the second person singualr *were* in the pre-instruction study. It is also not found in the speech samples taken during instruction. *Was* was consistently used as a substitute for *were*.

In the pre-instruction study Angela correctly supplied third person singular *was* 93% of the time. In the second study *was* was correctly supplied 100% of the time in Tapes 2, 5 and 6. In Tape 7, the latest tape made, the percentage dipped to 87%, lower than the figure recorded in the pre-instruction study.

For the first person plural copula *was* was consistently substituted for *were* in both studies. For the second person

Tape 4

Distribution of Forms Supplied in Past Tense Copula Contexts

	Pre-instruc.	Tape 1	Tape 2	Tape 3	Tape 4	Tape 5	Tape 6	Tape 7	Imi.
Singular									
1st was	1.00 ($\frac{10}{10}$)	1.00 ($\frac{3}{3}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	.83 ($\frac{5}{6}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)		.88 ($\frac{7}{8}$)	.92 ($\frac{11}{12}$)	
ø				.17 ($\frac{1}{6}$)			.12 ($\frac{1}{8}$)	.08 ($\frac{1}{12}$)	
2nd were	.00($\frac{0}{4}$)	.00($\frac{0}{3}$)				.00($\frac{0}{3}$)	.00($\frac{0}{1}$)		
was	1.00 ($\frac{4}{4}$)	.67 ($\frac{2}{3}$)				1.00 ($\frac{3}{3}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)		1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)
ø									
Ital.		.33 ($\frac{1}{3}$)							
3rd was	.93 ($\frac{78}{93}$)	.87 ($\frac{26}{30}$)	1.00 ($\frac{10}{10}$)	.88 ($\frac{14}{16}$)	.80 ($\frac{8}{10}$)	1.00($\frac{18}{18}$)	1.00($\frac{10}{10}$)	.87 ($\frac{41}{47}$)	.33 ($\frac{1}{3}$)
ø		.03 ($\frac{1}{30}$)		.12 ($\frac{2}{16}$)	.20 ($\frac{2}{10}$)			.13 ($\frac{6}{47}$)	.66 ($\frac{2}{3}$)
Ital.	.07 ($\frac{5}{83}$)	.10 ($\frac{3}{30}$)							
Plural									
1st were	.00($\frac{0}{10}$)	.00($\frac{0}{1}$)	.00($\frac{1}{1}$)						
was	1.00 ($\frac{10}{10}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	1.00 ($\frac{0}{1}$)						1.00 ($\frac{2}{2}$)
2nd were									
3rd were	.25 ($\frac{1}{4}$)	.00($\frac{0}{2}$)		.00($\frac{0}{4}$)	.00($\frac{0}{6}$)	.00($\frac{0}{2}$)	.00($\frac{0}{1}$)	.00($\frac{0}{6}$)	
was	.75 ($\frac{3}{4}$)	1.00 ($\frac{2}{2}$)		.50 ($\frac{2}{4}$)	.67 ($\frac{4}{6}$)	.50 ($\frac{1}{2}$)	1.00 ($\frac{1}{1}$)	.83 ($\frac{5}{6}$)	.60 ($\frac{3}{5}$)
Ital.				.50 ($\frac{2}{4}$)	.33 ($\frac{2}{6}$)	.50 ($\frac{1}{2}$)			
ø								.17 ($\frac{1}{6}$)	.40 ($\frac{2}{5}$)

plural, Angela used were only in the elicited imitations. For third person plural, was substituted for were 75% of the time in the pre-instruction study. In the study made during instruction were was never used; the copula was either deleted or was replaced by was or the Italian copula.

Instruction had no effect on the past tense copula. Angela continued to use the forms she used in the pre-instruction speech, that is, was is consistently used as the past tense copula.

Past Tense

Regular past tense. Table 5 gives the percentages for the correct usage of the regular past tense. In the pre-instruction study Angela did not supply the regular past tense ending for any verb. In the tapings made during instruction she used the regular past tense twice, once in Tape 4 and once in Tape 7.

In Tape 4 Angela was searching for the translation of an Italian word, which I supplied.

(Tape 4.19) Angela: I don't know what God destina - des- come si dice?

Inter.: Planned.

Angela: Planned for you.

In Tape 7, Angela said

(Tape 7.23) I hava children. I growed upa nice.

Regular past tense was introduced to the class in April 1977 and was reviewed in May and the fall of 1977. With only two uses of the regular past tense, one an echo and one used with a verb which has an irregular past, it can be safely assumed that instruction had no effect on this area of Angela's language system. Context and time words and phrases indicate the time being discussed.

Irregular past tense. Table 6 gives the percentages for

Table 5

Percent of Regular Past Tense Verbs Supplied in Obligatory Contexts

Pre.	.0	(0/120)
Tape 1	.0	(0/51)
Tape 2	.0	(0/22)
Tape 3	.0	(0/26)
Tape 4	.07	(1/14)
Tape 5	.0	(0/26)
Tape 6	.0	(0/28)
Tape 7	.03	(1/30)
Elicited Imitations	.0	(0/9)

Table 6

Percent of Irregular Past Tense Verbs Supplied in Obligatory Contexts

Pre.	.12	(27/230)
Tape 1	.10	(11/105)
Tape 2	.08	(3/37)
Tape 3	.27	(13/48)
Tape 4	.24	(12/50)
Tape 5	.14	(8/56)
Tape 6	.19	(16/85)
Tape 7	.07	(6/86)
Elicited Imitations	.71	(5/7)

irregular past tense for both studies. In the pre-instruction study Angela correctly supplied the irregular past tense 12% of the time. In Tapes 3, 4,5 and 6 the irregular past is supplied more often than in the pre-instruction study. In Tape 7, the latest tape made, the irregular past tense was supplied correctly only 7% of the time. In the elicited imitations Angela correctly supplied the irregular past tense 71% of the time. This figure does not truly indicate what is occurring in Angela's free speech.

In the pre-instruction study Angela correctly used the following irregular verbs some percentage of the time: forgot, heard, lost, saw, wrote, did and said. In the tapes made during instruction she primarily used these same verbs. Additionally,in Tape 2 she used bought, in Tape 3 won, in Tape 4 slept and in Tape 5 broke. The verbs forgot and lost were used for both present and past tense.

Irregular past tense verbs were not emphasized in the beginning ESL class Angela attended. They were discussed more thoroughly in the intermediate class she began attending in September 1977. Angela does show some improvement in four out of the seven tapes but whether that means she has learned something is not clear. She added only four new irregular verbs to the list of those verbs used correctly in the pre-instruction study and none of these new verbs was used after the irregular past tense had been introduced to the class. In fact, if we look at the percentages recorded for Tapes 6 and 7, those tapings which took place after this area had been introduced to the class, we observe that the figure for Tape 6 is higher than the pre-instruction figure and the figure for Tape 7 is lower than that of the first study. Thus, it is difficult to say definitely whether learning has indeed taken place.

Third Person Present Tense S

Table 7 gives the percentages for third person s for both studies. In the pre-instruction study, third person s was supplied 9% of the time. Knows, wants, goes and says were each used correctly some percentage of the time. In the second study the percentages for Tape 4 and Tape 7 are higher than the percentage recorded for the first study. In Tapes 1 through 6 the same present tense verbs were used correctly as in the pre-instruction study. In Tape 7 we find the use of brings, clicks and has. Angela's use of the clicks is a result of her echoing the word supplied by the interviewer.

(Tape 7.11) Angela: (Discussing when the tape will finish) I don't know cause è half hour /driŋ/.

Inter.: Oh, it clicks.

Angela: Clicks, yea.

In looking at what was taught the month prior to each taping, it is important to note whether any increase in the percentages recorded could be the result of a structure being taught or reviewed in a particular month. Third person singular s was taught before the tapings began and was reviewed in February, March and June of 1977. Tape 4 was recorded in May 1977 and Tape 7 in March 1978. Third person s was not reviewed in the months prior to these tapings. If instruction were to have had a direct effect on Angela's speech, we would expect the percentages for February and March of 1977 (Tapes 1 and 2) to be higher than the percentages recorded for the pre-instruction study. The opposite is true, however, with Tapes 1 and 2 showing the lowest percentages of all the tapings. Because the increases in the percentages from the pre-instruction study to the second study were minimal (only 4%

Tape 7

Percent of Third Person Present Tense s Supplied in Obligatory Contexts

Pre.	.09	(17/184)
Tape 1	.01	(1/74)
Tape 2	.03	(2/65)
Tape 3	.08	(6/72)
Tape 4	.13	(6/45)
Tape 5	.04	(3/74)
Tape 6	.05	(3/73)
Tape 7	.11	(11/104)
Elicited Imitations	.11	(1/19)

in Tape 4 and 2% in Tape 7), it would appear that instruction had no significant effect in this area of Angela's speech.

Plural

Table 8 shows the percentages supplied in both studies for noun plural. Years and shoes are excluded from the analysis in the second column so that a more accurate assessment of what was occurring in Angela's speech could be made. If we look at the figures for the plural which exclude years and shoes, we see that the plural was correctly supplied 15% of the time in the pre-instruction study. The figures for Tapes 1, 2, 5 and 6 are higher than 15%. The percentage for the last taping made, Tape 7, is the lowest of all the tapings. Noun plural was introduced to Angela's class before the tapings began and was reviewed throughout the year. The increase in the percentages from the first to the second study are, again, minimal and, therefore, we would have to say that instruction had no significant effect on noun plurals in Angela's speech.

Summary

I feel that the results of this analysis have shown that instruction has had a minimal effect on Angela's pidginized speech. Her negatives are still mainly no V or can't V. The percentage of correctly supplied elicited negatives increased from the first study to the second study, but this is an artificial task and does not indicate increased performance in free speech. Only first person singular present tense copula am, first person singular past tense copula was and third person singular past tense copula was are correctly supplied over 50% of the time in each speech sample. Time is still generally marked by context and time words and phrases. Only certain nouns are marked for plural.

Table 8

Percent Plural S Supplied in Obligatory Contexts

			Years & Shoes excluded	
Pre.	.33	(26/79)	.15	(9/62)
Tape 1	.19	(6/32)	.16	(5/31)
Tape 2	.32	(9/28)	.21	(5/24)
Tape 3	.46	(16/35)	.10	(2/21)
Tape 4	.45	(26/58)	.09	(3/25)
Tape 5	.32	(7/22)	.17	(3/18)
Tape 6	.29	(4/14)	.23	(3/13)
Tape 7	.23	(17/74)	.08	(5/62)
Elicited Imitations	.25	(2/8)	.25	(2/8)

The positive effects of instruction are minimal when compared to the amount of instruction and the number of structures and morphemes studied. Angela's speech during instruction is virtually identical to her speech prior to instruction.

Conclusions

What are the reasons behind Angela's lack of development in English, even after having undergone formal instruction? I will look at three possible reasons: age, social distance and motivation.

Angela entered the United States when she was 37 years old. While in New York she lived mostly with Italians and most of her dealings in the business community were with Italian speakers. This situation changed with her move to California at the age of 60. Many of the people she came in contact with neither spoke nor understood Italian. When Angela began attending ESL classes she was 76 years of age. It may well be that Angela was past the age when a person is able to learn a second language well due to neurological or cognitive reasons.

The Heidelberg Project (1976) which deals with the acquisition of German by immigrant workers has shown an inverse relationship between age upon entering Germany and language acquisition. The speakers with the most syntactic development entered Germany about the age of 20 whereas the speakers with the lowest syntactic development arrived after 40 years of age. Those who had entered Germany between the ages of 25 and 35 were generally in the middle group. The researchers caution that these results may not have neurological or cognitive cause; social factors may also be responsible. They point out the case of a worker who entered Germany at 53 years of age whose situation would seem to

give him contact with Germans, but, nevertheless, he was in the lowest syntactic group. Therefore, it is not clear whether older learners have less success for neurological, cognitive reasons or for social reasons.

In discussing the reasons for Angela's pidginization in the pre-instruction study, I discussed social distance as a possible explanation. Social distance as seen by Schumann (1975) involves an individual's relationship as a member of one language group to another language group whose members speak a different language. Sociological factors such as domination versus subordination, assimilation versus acculturation versus preservation, enclosure, size and congruence are all involved in social distance.

In the 1930's, the time of Angela's move to the United States, Italians were regarded, on the whole, as second class citizens. As a result they were not accepted into the mainstream of American society. They were the subordinate culture. When Angela first moved to New York she lived in an all-Italian neighborhood and she had all Italian-speaking friends. These two factors (ghettoized existence and "second class" status) contributed to Angela's being socially distant from native English speakers. Her functional use of English was quite restricted and her language, therefore, pidginized.

Angela's social distance profile changed, however, with her move to California. She no longer lived in an all-Italian neighborhood and she had more Italian-speaking friends. Italians had become part of American society and were no longer looked on as second class citizens. Angela became involved with church and senior citizen groups whose members were mostly non-Italians. She could no longer rely on her children to act as go-betweens or inter-

preters since they were not members of these organizations.

Her children all married Italians or Italian-Americans who both speak, or at least understand, Italian. Her older grandchildren speak and understand Italian, but the younger ones do not, so Angela must use her English to communicate with them.

Because of this change in her social distance profile, one would have expected Angela to have become more proficient in English. We have no idea what Angela's English was like prior to her move to California, but her English both prior to and after instruction has not progressed beyond the early stages of development.

Although she has become more socially proximate, it still remains that the members of her family accomodate the kind of English that she speaks. The same is true of her non-Italian speaking friends. They make every effort to understand her and they provide any words or phrases she may be having difficulty with.

There is no real need for Angela to improve her English. She is understood by the people most important to her and she understands them. Although she would like to be able to speak English more fluently and has attended classes to achieve this end, there is no real need which is motivating her.

This brings us to the third possible reason - motivation. Angela had wanted to attend ESL classes, but she had neither the time nor the opportunity. When I began teaching, the opportunity presented itself, so she decided to take advantage of it. Another reason for her coming was that she desired to see her granddaughter teach. She also came to keep me company - she worried about my driving home alone at night. She was not motivated to attend the class so she could better her position or because she was having

a great deal of trouble communicating with native speakers. Initially, she was motivated to attend because her granddaughter was the teacher. She began to enjoy herself and hoped she would learn something. I have heard Angela say that she has an easier time reading now. She may be simply trying to justify to herself all the time and effort she has put into the class or it could very well be that her receptive competence has improved.

Bibliography

Hall, R.A. Pidgin and Creole Languages. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Heidelberger Forschengsprojekt, Pidgin-Deutsch spanischer und italienischer Arbeiter in der Bundesrepublik. Untersuchungen zur Erlernung des Deutschen Durch Auslandiche Arbeiter. Arbeitsbericht III des Heidelberger DFG-Projektes. Germanistiches Seminar der Universtat, Heidelberger, 69 Heidelberg 1, Karlstr. 16, July 1976.

Hymes, Dell (Ed.). Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Krashen, Stephen D. "Some Issues Relating to the Monitor Model". Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, Miami, April 1977.

Samarin, William. Salient and substantive pidginization. In Hymes (ed.) Pidginization and Creolization of Languages, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 117-140.

Schumann, John H. The implications of pidginization for the study of the adult second language learner. In Schumann and Stenson (eds.) New Frontiers in Second Language Learning. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1975, 137-152.

Schumann, John H. Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1976, 26, 135-143.

Schumann, John H. "The Relationship of Pidginization, Creolization and Decreolization to Second Language Acquisition" Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, Mexico City, April 1978.

Schumann, John H. & Stenson, N. New Frontiers in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1975.

Whinnom, Keith. Linguistic hybridization and the "special case" of pidgins and creoles. In Hymes (ed.) Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 91-115.